1		
2		
3	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
4	DISTRICT OF NEVADA	
5 6 7 8	Plaintiff(s), v.	Case No.: 2:19-cv-01292-GMN-NJK  ORDER  (Docket No. 26)
9	Defendant(s).	
11 12	, in the same of t	
13	Docket No. 25. The Court granted the motion because "Plaintiffs failed to [timely] respond" and	
14	because the Court reviewed the motion and found it to be meritorious. <i>Id.</i> at 1 (citing Docket Nos.	
15	18, 24, making clear the deadline for Plaintiffs' response to Defendant's motion to compel).	
16	Without explanation, Plaintiffs now file an untimely, unsigned response to Defendant's	
17	already-granted motion. Docket No. 26. Nevertheless, after careful review of Plaintiffs' response,	
18	8 the Court's order at Docket No. 25 remains in effect and unchanged. 1	
19	IT IS SO ORDERED.	
20	Dated: January 21, 2020	A
21		Nancy J. Koppe
22		United States Magistrate Judge
23		
24		
<ul><li>25</li><li>26</li></ul>		
27 28	The Court also reminds Plaintiffs' couparte unless specifically permitted by the Local	nsel that it is inappropriate to call chambers <i>ex</i> Rules or the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.